

Eron king

(b) (6)

01/30/2012 08:45 AM

To Elizabeth Allen

cc esseneinfo, Chad Schulze, danandmaya, dan.tebbuttlaw,
gary, jae.p.douglas, karen.bishop, keo1, larkin, Richard
Kauffman, Sheila Fleming

bcc

Subject Re: Regarding Environmental Samples

Hi all,

I guess I don't understand how the last urine samples were "baseline".
You have already said that the same people might not be tested again,
and they didn't even spray the chemicals that were checked. How does
that make the last round baselines?

Thanks,

-Eron

On Jan 30, 2012, at 8:13 AM, Allen.Elizabeth@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> Hi Day,
>
> we've been fairly consistent in clearly noting that the data collected
> to date are representative of what we refer to as "baseline" conditions,
> and that they are not representative of conditions and potential
> exposures during or immediately following active applications. We
> remain committed to being very clear about that fact, though I'm not
> sure we're ready to resort to shouting ;-)
>
> Have a great day!
>
> Elizabeth
>
> Elizabeth Allen
> Office of Environmental Assessment
> Risk Evaluation Unit
> US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
> 1200 Sixth Ave, Suite 900
> Seattle, WA 98101
>
> 206-553-1807
> allen.elizabeth@epa.gov
>
>
>
> From: esseneinfo@aol.com
> To: Elizabeth Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
> Cc: Chad Schulze/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, (b) (6),
> (b) (6), (b) (6),
> jae.p.douglas@state.or.us, karen.bishop@state.or.us,
> keol@cdc.gov, Richard Kauffman/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> (b) (6), Sheila Fleming/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> larkin@beyondtoxics.org
> Date: 01/27/2012 01:13 PM
> Subject: Re: Regarding Environmental Samples
>
>
>
> Thanks Dr Allen (Elizabeth).

> I understand the reasons that Chad explained for taking only
> environmental samples from plants that were not alive during the spring
> spray season: it was to test to see if ongoing volatilization (forgive
> spelling) was occurring even during the non-spray season.
> My concern is that that point must be SHOUTED LOUD AND CLEAR in the
> report being prepared by your team so that the public, media, and
> government officials -- including the Governor himself -- do not simply
> get told that "nothing (or little) was found in the environmental
> samples" and thus be completely misled into believing that
> environmental samples had been taken after a spray and nothing found,
> which was not the case. This point is so significant that I humbly ask
> -- in fact, beg! -- that it not simply be acknowledged "somewhere" in
> the report and all related communications to media, public, and
> government, but that it be right up front, stated in an opening
> executive summary. Does that seem fair to you?

>
>
> -----Original Message-----

> From: Elizabeth Allen <Allen.Elizabeth@epamail.epa.gov>
> To: esseneinfo <esseneinfo@aol.com>
> Cc: Chad Schulze <Schulze.Chad@epamail.epa.gov>; danandmaya
> (b) (6); dan.tebbuttlaw (b) (6); gary
> (b) (6); jae.p.douglas <jae.p.douglas@state.or.us>;
> karen.bishop <karen.bishop@state.or.us>; keol <keol@cdc.gov>; Richard
> Kauffman <Kauffman.Richard@epamail.epa.gov>; spiralmom
> (b) (6); Sheila Fleming <Fleming.Sheila@epamail.epa.gov>
> Sent: Fri, Jan 27, 2012 12:56 pm
> Subject: Re: Regarding Environmental Samples

>
> Hello Day,

>
> citing from OHA's sampling protocol (which is available from their web
> site at:

>
> <http://public.health.oregon.gov/HealthyEnvironments/TrackingAssessment/EnvironmentalHealthAssessment/Pages/Highway36TriangleLakeExposureInvestigation.aspx>

>),
> on page 5 it does note that the data to be collected in the Fall of
> 2011 will "focus on the potential for chronic or ongoing exposures to
> pesticides." It's fair to conclude that the intent was to determine
> whether any exposure might be occurring between spray periods. We have
> never meant to imply that the sampling to date was representative of the
> conditions that occur during or immediately following active spraying.
> It was also important for chain-of-custody procedures that the samplers
> collect only plants still "in the ground," so to speak. So if any
> portions of the plants still growing were edible, those parts were given
> preference for sampling, as that would have given us a little insight
> into whether any possible "off-season volatilization" was detectable on
> edible plants. But that said, I think we've all been very clear that
> the Fall sampling was intended to represent something of a "baseline,"
> and I'm sure you share our utmost confidence that OHA will be presenting
> the results in a completely objective and unbiased manner.

>
> Elizabeth

>
> Elizabeth Allen
> Office of Environmental Assessment
> Risk Evaluation Unit
> US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
> 1200 Sixth Ave, Suite 900

> Seattle, WA 98101
>
> 206-553-1807
> allen.elizabeth@epa.gov
>
>
>
> From: esseneinfo@aol.com
> To: Richard Kauffman/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> (b) (6),
> Chad Schulze/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, (b) (6)
> Cc: (b) (6), (b) (6), Elizabeth
> Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, jae.p.douglas@state.or.us,
> keol@cdc.gov, karen.bishop@state.or.us
> Date: 01/25/2012 11:55 AM
> Subject: Regarding Environmental Samples
>
>
>
>

> Richard and all, this is Day with a request.
> In regard to the upcoming report on environmental samples and any
> related communications from you to government, citizens, or media, I
> request that the following important point be clearly articulated.
> When Chad and Erin from Seattle EPA came to my property to take
> environmental samples, they explained something that you need to
> likewise make clear in your report. They explained that the reason that
> they were NOT taking samples from plants that had been growing on the
> land at the time of the spring sprays; rather, they were intentionally
> taking samples of plant foilage that was more recent, for the following
> reason. Chad said that the purpose was not to find evidence that the
> past sprays had drifted to our property -- that if that were the goal
> they would indeed be sampling different foilage -- but that instead the
> purpose was to test the theory that, if as some persons have feared
> might be the case, our region was so saturated with pesticide residue
> that, even in the absence of a recent spray, it continues to volatize
> and/or otherwise move onto our properties. Chad and Erin supplied that
> information when I inquired why they were taking samples of plants THAT
> HAD NOT EVEN BEEN ALIVE DURING THE SPRAY SEASON. Also, though we had
> honey that was from the spray season, honey was selected that was from
> more recent hives that would not relate to the spring spray season. At
> that time, I explained to Chad and he agreed, that, at the time of the
> written report on the environmental samples, it would be very important
> that the above information be clearly communicated, since otherwise
> negative results -- not finding pesticide on the samples -- will be
> wrongly interpreted by everyone not privy to the above to mean that the
> foilage that was alive durring the spray season was not found to have
> pesticide residue on it when tested in the fall.
>

> My request, then, is that the above be made very very clear in the
> report and every other communication to the community, government --
> including the report to the Governor -- and media. Thanks, Day Owen
>
>
>
>
>
>
> -

>
>
>
>
>
>